

**RIMAC & MARTIN**  
**A Professional Corporation**  
JOSEPH M. RIMAC – CSBN 72381  
WILLIAM REILLY – CSBN 177550  
KEVIN G. GILL – CSBN 226819  
1051 Divisadero Street  
San Francisco, CA 94115  
*w\_reilly@rimacmartin.com*  
Telephone: (415) 561-8440  
Facsimile: (415) 561-8430

MCGUINN, HILLSMAN & PALEFSKY  
CLIFF PALEFSKY (State Bar No. 77683)  
KEITH EHRMAN (State Bar No. 106985)  
535 Pacific Ave.  
San Francisco, CA 94133  
*KAEMHP@aol.com*  
Telephone: (415) 421-9292  
Facsimile: (415) 403-0202

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
**HUGO SLUIMER**

**DOLL AMIR & ELEY LLP**  
GREGORY L. DOLL – CSBN 193205  
1888 Century Park East, Suite 1106  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
Telephone: (310) 557-9100  
Facsimile: (310) 557-9101

Attorneys for Defendants  
VERITY, INC., and THE VERITY INC.  
CHANGE IN CONTROL AND  
SEVERANCE BENEFIT PLAN

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

## ***E-FILING***

## I. INTRODUCTION

2 Upon review of the Court's July 22, 2008 Order on the cross-motions for summary judgment  
3 and the subsequent July 25, 2008 Minute Order, a question has come up as to whether or not the  
4 Court meant to preserve plaintiff's claim for statutory penalties for further litigation. Plaintiff  
5 contacted defendant in order to meet and confer on a motion for attorney fees, and defendant's  
6 counsel stated he believed such a motion was premature, as the claim for statutory penalties was still  
7 active. Consequently, and pursuant to Local Rule 7-11, the parties move for clarification of the  
8 status of Plaintiff's claim for statutory penalties in the wake of the Court's orders. The parties also  
9 stipulate to extend the time for plaintiff to file a motion for attorney's fees pursuant to Local Rules  
10 54-6 and 6-2 so this question can be resolved, and request that the Court confirm the stipulation by  
11 signing the proposed order, below.

## II. FACTS

13 On July 22, 2008, the Court issued an Order granting plaintiff's motion for summary  
14 judgment in part and denying defendant's motion to dismiss and motion for summary judgment.  
15 Relevant to the question at issue here, the Order stated:

16 Plaintiff also moves for summary judgment on the question whether  
17 defendant should be subject to statutory penalties for failure to furnish  
18 documents requested by plaintiff. *See* 29 U.S.C. §§ 1022(a),  
19 1024(b)(4) & 1132(c)(1). The Court finds that plaintiff has not, at this  
time, met his burden of showing that documents that were statutorily-  
required to be produced were not in fact produced. Plaintiff's motion  
for summary judgment on this ground is DENIED.

20 (*Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment and Denying Defendants' Motion to*  
21 *Dismiss and Motion for Summary Judgment*, 16:17-21 (July 22, 2008)).

22 On July 25, 2008, the Court issued a Minute Order which stated that plaintiff's motion for  
23 summary judgment had been granted and "no further dates set in this case." (*Minute Order*, 1 (July  
24 25, 2008)).

25 On July 29, 2008, plaintiff's counsel wrote to defendants' counsel to meet and confer  
26 regarding plaintiff's intended motion for fees, costs and interest under 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g), as  
27 required by Local Rule 54-6. That same day, defendants' counsel responded: "The case is still active  
28 regarding your request for statutory penalties. On what basis do you believe your motion is ripe.

1 Please advise. Thanks."

2 On July 30, 2008, plaintiff's counsel responded and agreed that there appears to be some  
 3 ambiguity between the July 22, 2008 Order and the July 25, 2008 minute Order as to whether the  
 4 statutory penalties claim remains to be litigated. Plaintiff's counsel requested that the parties file this  
 5 *Joint Motion for Clarification and Joint Stipulation to Extend the Time to File a Motion for*  
 6 *Attorney's Fees* to ensure that plaintiff did not waive his right to file a motion for attorney's fees.  
 7 That same day, defendants' counsel agreed to the filing of this joint motion.

8 An additional factor weighing on the requested extension is that two of plaintiff's counsel  
 9 have vacation plans for the weeks of July 28, 2008 and August 4, 2008.

10 **III. RELIEF REQUESTED**

11 The parties request that the Court clarify whether it contemplates further litigation or briefing  
 12 on plaintiff's statutory penalties claim. The parties stipulate that, if the Court determines no further  
 13 litigation or briefing is necessary, that plaintiff's time to file his motion for attorney's fees, costs and  
 14 interest be extended through and including August 22, 2008.

15 Good cause exists for this brief extension because of the parties confusion in the wake of July  
 16 22, 2008 Order and the July 25, 2008 Minute Order, and because of the preplanned vacation  
 17 schedules of plaintiff's counsel.

18 SO STIPULATED:

19 Respectfully submitted,

20 RIMAC & MARTIN, P.C.

21 DATED: July 31, 2008

22 By: /s/ WILLIAM REILLY  
 WILLIAM REILLY  
 23 Attorneys for Plaintiff

24 DOLL AMIR & ELEY LLP

25 DATED: July 31, 2008

26 By: /s/ GREGORY L. DOLL  
 GREGORY L. DOLL  
 27 Attorneys for Defendants  
 VERITY, INC., and THE VERITY INC.  
 CHANGE IN CONTROL AND  
 28 SEVERANCE BENEFIT PLAN

1 The time for plaintiff to file a motion for attorney fees is extended through August 22,  
2 2008.

3  
4 SO ORDERED:

5  
6  
7 DATED: \_\_\_\_\_, 2008

  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

THE HONORABLE SUSAN ILLSTON